

## REMARKS

Consideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 61-120 are pending in the application with Claims 61 and 73 being independent. Claims 92-115 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 61 and 73 have been amended for clarity with respect to the specification and drawings, and not for reasons relating to the statutory requirements for patentability.

Claims 61 and 73 have been amended to clarify that: (i) the endovascular sleeve is for delivery of a pair of guidewires to a bifurcated body passageway of a patient, (ii) the first distal end extends distally beyond the second distal end, and (iii) the second tubular passageway has a length such that the second proximal end extends proximally from the patient. These amendments are fully supported throughout the present application. See, for example, Figure 11.

Claims 61, 64-69, 73, 76-81, 85-86 and 115-120 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,902,331 (Bonner).

This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested in light of the following remarks.

Apparently Figure 3 of Bonner is relied upon for the analysis set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. The first tubular passageway of the instant claims is compared with element 71 of Bonner Figure 3, and the second tubular passageway of the instant claims is compared with element 61 of Bonner Figure 3. It is evident from the teachings of Bonner that element 61 does not have a length such that its proximal end extends proximally from the patient as now recited in Claims 61 and 73 of the present application.

Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).


Claims 62-63, 67-69, 74-75, and 85-91 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bonner in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,669,924 (Shaknovich). Claims 70-72 and 80-84 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bonner in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,830,196 (Hicks). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants submit that neither of Shaknovich and Hicks remedies the deficiencies of Bonner as set forth above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

It is believed that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request prompt issuance of a Notice thereof.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 625-3500. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicants  
Dawn C. Hayes  
Registration No. 44,751

Patent Administrator  
KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN  
525 West Monroe Street  
Suite 1600  
Chicago, Illinois 60661-3693  
Facsimile No.: (312) 902-1061